



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/597,657

08/16/2008

Matias Mandagaran

170.003

4479

38245

7590

09/14/2010

JEROME D. JACKSON (JACKSON PATENT LAW OFFICE)

211 N. UNION STREET, SUITE 100

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

MULLEN, THOMAS J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2612

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/14/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@japalaof.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/597,657	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MANDAGARAN, MATIAS	
	<b>Examiner</b> /Thomas J. Mullen/	<b>Art Unit</b> 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-51 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2008 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                       |                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                           | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                                |

Art Unit: 2612

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because (i) it includes "legal phraseology" (note "said beams"), and (ii) starts with the implied phrase "The invention relates to". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application (in particular, note the section headings). These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

#### **Arrangement of the Specification**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

Art Unit: 2612

(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

Thus, on page 1 after the title should (preferably) be inserted the heading "Background of the Invention" (it is noted that the headings, and the wording of the headings, are optional; however, the above headings are customarily used in U.S. patent applications for ease of reference); on p. 5, line 22, the heading "State of the art" would preferably be --Description of the Related Art--; on p. 10, line 1, the heading "Graphical description" would preferably be --Brief Description of the Drawings--; and on p. 12, line 22, the heading "Detailed description of an embodiment example" would preferably be --Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiment(s)--.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

the use of legal phraseology in the specification should be avoided, note e.g. "said housing" (p. 1, line 4), "said solutions" (p. 1, line 15), "Said reflector" (p. 5, line 15), etc.;  
p. 1, line 18, it appears that "whished" should be --wished-- (or --desired--, etc.);  
p. 1, line 26, it is unclear what color(s) is/are represented by the term "fume" (see also p. 3, line 9);  
p. 2, line 2, it appears that "divers" should be --drivers--;  
it is unclear which element or device is being referred to by "it" (p. 2, line 31) and/or "they" (p. 3, line 1);  
p. 4, line 25, "fiber glass" should be one word;  
p. 6, line 18, "Donelly" should be --Donnelly--;  
p. 7, lines 28 and 29, it appears that "lightening" (one occurrence on each line) should be --lighting--;  
p. 10, lines 6-7, "(t)he reflector elongated forwards or collimator" is vaguely worded;  
p. 10, lines 8-9, "the solid or hollow projector or passageway (8) backwards or focus 2 (F2)" is vaguely worded;  
p. 11, line 28, it appears that "(110)" should be --(100)-- (note Fig. 12C, and e.g. p. 10, line 18 by comparison);

Art Unit: 2612

consistent terminology should be used in the specification to refer to an element or device that is associated with a given reference character (note 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4))--e.g., where reference character "R" appears to be used to identify one or more "prisms" (see e.g. p. 11, line 4), the word "prism" (or "prisms") should likewise be used with later occurrences of this reference character in the specification--note e.g. "body (R)" at p. 12, lines 2 and 7, "passageway (R)" at p. 14, line 1, "(R)" at p. 15, line 24, "body (R)" at p. 15, line 26, etc. (note para. 5 below);

p. 12, line 23, it appears that "Just as" should be simply, --As--;

p. 12, lines 24-25, it is unclear what is meant by "the previously cited functions A, B, C and D";

p. 12, line 29, it is unclear which part of the associated sentence (on the preceding 7 lines) "or not" refers to;

p. 13, lines 7-8, it is unclear if "areas (F1) or focus 1" refers to two alternate areas, or just a single area, and likewise if "(areas) (F2) or focus 2" refers to alternate areas or a single area;

p. 13, line 31, it appears that "molesting" would be clearer as --shining in--, or something similar;

p. 14, line 4, "towards (P1)" is unclear as to whether "(P1)" is an object, a direction, etc.;

p. 14, line 14, it appears that "just as" should be simply, --as--;

p. 16, lines 9-10, "of focal centre which said bulb would have to outside the device" is vaguely worded;

p. 16, line 27, it appears that "to move" should be --to be moved--;

p. 16, last line, it is unclear what is meant by "radiator surfaces";

p. 17, line 1, it is unclear what element or device is being referred to by "the first";

p. 17, line 6, it is unclear what is meant by "the radiant core (20)";

p. 17, line 14, it appears that "Frontal" should be --frontal--;

p. 18, lines 9-10, it appears that --the vehicle general circuit-- would be clearer as --the vehicle's electrical system--;

p. 18, lines 15-16, it appears that "boot" and "bonnet" would be clearer as --trunk-- and --hood--, respectively;

p. 18, line 19, it appears that "wheel" should be --tire--; and

Art Unit: 2612

p. 18, line 20, it appears that "facilitates vision of other drivers of a person" would be clearer as --facilitates other drivers seeing a person--, or something similar.

Appropriate correction is required.

5. (i) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters A, C and D have each been used to designate multiple elements, note progressive lighting areas (i.e., B-C 1, B-C 2, etc.--see Figs. 2 and 6); flat surface A, associated with reflector 2 (Fig. 1); direction arrows A (four occurrences in Fig. 2); circuit chip C (Fig. 4); dimmer circuit D (Figs. 3 and 6); and "critical distance" D-C 13 (Fig. 3--see p. 13, line 24). Also note in the specification, "cathode soldering points C" (see p. 18, line 5) and "progressive frontal light (B-C-D)" (see p. 18, line 11). Regarding the "progressive lighting areas" and "critical distance", even if "D-C" or "B-C" is theoretically distinguishable from "C" by itself and/or "D" by itself, a likelihood of confusion would result from use of these reference characters for different elements in the drawings (and the specification).

(ii) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "X" (and/or "x") has been used to designate multiple elements, note "initial focal plane (or path)" x/X (Figs. 7, 9 and 13A-C--see p. 15, lines 1 and 12), "lower vortex" X (Fig. 11C--see p. 17, line 12) and/or "primary beam" x (Fig. 13--see p. 12, line 1).

6. (i) The drawings are objected to because in at least Figs. 8-9, the reference characters as well as the figure designations (e.g., "FIG. 8") are less than 1/8 in. in height (37 CFR 1.84(p)(3)).

(ii) The drawings are objected to because it is unclear whether element 45 in Fig. 8 is a "bulb" (note p. 15, line 31) or an "expansion chamber" (note p. 16, line 29).

(iii) The drawings are objected to because it is unclear how reference numerals ending in "bis" are to be distinguished from the same reference numeral without "bis".

7. As to para's. 5-6 above, corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted

Art Unit: 2612

after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

8. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do include the following reference characters which are not mentioned in the description:

11, 18, 19, 28, 29, 35, 43, 60, 61.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

9. Claims 27-51 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 27, line 9, "the illuminated field" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 27, line 14, it appears that "these" should be simply --the-- (note "a number of light-emitting elements" on line 11).

Claim 27, last line, "the intermittent light function" lacks clear antecedent basis (note e.g. "intermittent signal" on line 4).

Claim 28, line 4, "the first beam" lacks clear antecedent basis.

Claim 28, lines 5-6, "the rearward oriented area" lacks clear antecedent basis.

Claim 29, lines 2-3, "the reflector" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 29, last line, it appears that "visible for" should be --visible to--.

Claim 30, line 3, "the outside transparent cover" lacks clear antecedent basis.

Art Unit: 2612

Claim 30, line 4, it appears that "plate" should be --the plate-- (note "second transparent plate" on line 2).

Claim 30, line 5, "the reflector" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 30, line 8, "the system" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 30, line 8, "the dissipating fins" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 30, line 9, "the ventilated source or core" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 30, line 10, "the resistive circuit" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 30, last line, "the water" lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 31-51 should be carefully checked for instances of minor informalities, lack of antecedent basis, etc., similar to and/or additional to the ones listed above.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 27-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 27, line 1, "A multisignal device being applicable to a rear-view mirror..." is indefinite as to whether "applicable" implies any particular structural and/or electronic and/or functional combination of the "device" and the "mirror".

Claim 27, lines 4-5, "projecting the light in the forward, sideward and rearward directions" is indefinite since the frame of reference for "forward", "sideward" and "rearward" is not clearly set forth.

Where claim 27 recites several different elements or components on lines 1-5, it is unclear which particular element/component is intended by "it" (line 5).

Claim 27, lines 5-6, "two signaling units being arranged in a joint or separate arrangement" is indefinite as to the intended distinction between "joint" and "separate", as these terms would apply to "two signaling units" per se.



Art Unit: 2612

In claim 27, the relationship between the the "light source" (line 3), the "two signaling units" (line 5) and the "array of light emitters" (line 6) is not clearly set forth.

Claim 27, lines 6-7, the array of light emitters being "progressively switched on in a sequential, combined and/or consecutive manner" is indefinite since (i) it is unclear how "sequential" and "consecutive" are intended to differ in meaning, in this context; and (ii) it is unclear what is meant by a "combined" manner of progressive switching.

Claim 27, lines 8-9, "...and thus allowing to cover a wide range with their light beams" is indefinite since (i) it is unclear whether "their" refers to the "array of light emitters" (line 6), or to some other devices or components; (ii) the scope of "wide range" is unclear, i.e. the particular frame of reference for a "wide range" cannot be determined; (iii) the relationship between the "light beams" and the "intermittent signal" (line 4) is not clearly set forth; and (iv) it is unclear how "thus" associates "cover(ing) a wide range with...light beams" with the immediately-preceding recitation (lines 6-7), i.e. it is not apparent that a wide beam coverage necessarily follows from progressive switching on of light emitters (e.g., unless it is also recited that the individual light emitters face in different directions, have different coverage areas, etc.).

Claim 27, line 10, "in a rearward direction" is indefinite since the scope of "rearward" is unclear, i.e. the particular frame of reference for a "rearward" direction cannot be determined.

Claim 27, line 10, it is unclear if "and/or towards an external side of the vehicle" implies that the two directions recited prior to "and/or"--i.e., "in a vertically downward direction and in a rearward direction" (lines 9-10)--are being defined with respect to an "internal side" of the vehicle.

Claim 27, lines 10-11, it is unclear what is meant by an array of light emitters "integrating" a number of light emitting elements.

Claim 27, lines 12-13, "conductive paths forming a double-faced circuit or two parallel or nonparallel, opposite circuits" is indefinite since (i) the scopes of "double-faced" and of "opposite" are unclear, i.e. it is respectively unclear how "double-faced" is intended to further define a "circuit", and how "opposite" is intended to further define two "circuits"; and (ii) it is further unclear how "parallel or non-parallel" is intended to further define two "circuits" (i.e., it appears that any given pair of circuits are either "parallel" or "non-parallel" with respect to each

Art Unit: 2612

other). Also, it is unclear if the "conductive paths" are in fact intended to interconnect the "light-emitting elements" on line 11.

Claim 27, line 13, "the path-carrying faces" lacks clear antecedent basis and/or is indefinite, i.e. the preceding recitation (lines 12-13) does not clearly recite "faces" per se, nor that plural such "faces" each carry a "path".

Claim 27, lines 13-14, it is unclear if "...being connected by an electric bridge" specifically refers to connecting the multiple "circuits" recited on lines 12-13, or merely to connecting the "faces" themselves (line 13); further, if the "circuits" are intended, it is unclear if "bridge" refers to any particular handling of an electrical signal being input to or output from one or both of the "circuits", or merely refers to electrically "bridging" the two otherwise disconnected "circuits".

Claim 27, lines 14-15, it is unclear if "a transparent cover" is in fact the same "cover" as "a lower housing cover" on line 3, or if these are different "covers".

Claim 27, line 15, it is unclear how the "light path" relates to the "wide range" recited on lines 8-9 (discussed above), e.g. it is unclear if the "path" and the "range" refer to the same or different spatial regions.

Claim 27, line 15, it is unclear if "one and the same supporting core" in fact refers to the "supporting core" recited on line 11-12, or to a different such "core".

Claim 28, line 2, it is unclear which particular element/component is intended by "it" (note discussion of claim 27, line 5 above).

Claim 28, line 3, it is unclear if "fume" (with an accent mark over the "e") is intended to be a type of color; i.e., it is unclear what color this term represents.

Claim 28, line 3, "among others" is indefinite since the scope of this phrase cannot be determined. Note MPEP 2173.05(d).

Claim 28, lines 4-5, "the progressive signal" lacks clear antecedent basis, and the relationship between the "progressive signal" (line 4) and the "intermittent signal" (line 5) is unclear.

Claim 28, last 3 lines, the subject matter starting with "the intermittent signal covering the rearward oriented area taking as a reference..." (through the end of the claim) is generally vaguely worded; e.g., (i) it is unclear if "covering" (line 5) and "covered" (line 6) refer to one (or

Art Unit: 2612

both) of the "covers" recited in claim 27 (lines 3 and 15, respectively), or to some other element(s) or act(s), (ii) it is unclear what previously recited signal, element, etc., the phrase "taking as a reference..." refers to, and (iii) "the running axis" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 29, line 1, it is unclear which particular element/component is intended by "it" (note discussion of claim 27, line 5 above).

Claim 29, lines 1-4, the use of terms such as "being" (line 3) and "having" (line 3), without a specific element or component immediately preceding these terms, render the associated limitation(s) unclear; i.e., it is unclear which particular element or component the occurrences of "being" and "having" on line 3 refer to (note "light outlet"/"path", line 2; "transparent cover", line 2; and reflector, line 3).

Claim 29, lines 1-2, the relationship (if any) between "a rearwardly oriented light outlet" and the "light source" and/or "array of light emitters" recited in claim 27 (see lines 3 and 6, respectively) is unclear.

Claim 29, lines 3-4, "a concave, tube-shaped bottom" is indefinite as it is unclear how "concave" further modifies "tube-shaped", or vice versa (note that a "concave" shape and a "tub(ular)" shape are fundamentally different "shapes").

Claim 29, line 4, "the light exiting at the end" is indefinite as to which element or component's "end" is being referred to.

Claim 29, lines 4-5, "through a zone being delimited by two adjacent surfaces" is indefinite as to which element or component's "surfaces" is/are being referred to.

Claim 29, line 5, it is unclear what is meant by "the increased difference between the surfaces".

Claim 29, line 5-6, it is unclear what is meant by "a solid passage for the light".

In claim 29, it is unclear if "path" (line 2), "zone" (line 4) and "passage" (line 6) refer to the same or different physical regions and/or means for conveying the light.

Claim 29, line 6, "incorporating a series of micropisms" is indefinite as to which previously-recited element or component this refers to (note the discussion of "being" and "having" above, as to claim 29, line 3).

Claim 30, lines 1-2, "the steaming up and "the condensation" each lack antecedent basis, and are indefinite as to which element's "steaming up" and/or "condensation" is being referred to.

Art Unit: 2612

Claim 30, line 2, it is unclear which particular element/component is intended by "it" (note discussion of claim 27, line 5 above).

Claim 30, lines 4-5, "this latter" (two occurrences) is vaguely worded and/or indefinite as to which element or component is intended.

Claim 30, line 6, "possibly provided with..." is indefinite as to whether the associated recitation is, in fact, a limitation of the claim.

Claim 30, lines 6-7, "the device being atmospherically linked in order to thus balance the temperature through an orifice" is indefinite, as (i) it is unclear what is meant by a device being "atmospherically linked", (ii) it is unclear in what sense the temperature is being "balance(d)" (e.g., which two or more components or regions are having their temperatures "balance(d)"), and (iii) it is unclear which element or component's "orifice" is intended.

Claim 30, lines 7-8, it is unclear if "an orifice" and "an external orifice" refer to the same or different orifices.

Claim 30, line 9, it is unclear if "a second circuit" is related to the "double-faced circuit" and/or "opposite circuits" recited in claim 27, i.e. as to whether the "second circuit" is one of the previously-recited circuits, or an additional circuit.

Claim 30, line 10, "instead of the surface an athermal film being alternately applied" is indefinite since (i) "the surface" lacks antecedent basis, and is indefinite as to which element's "surface" is intended; and (ii) it is unclear what the "athermal film" is being used "instead of" and/or "alternately" with.

Claims 31-51 should be carefully checked for instances of indefiniteness, similar to and/or additional to the ones listed above. For example, the reference numerals or characters appearing in claims 31 and 43-47 cannot be relied upon to identify specific elements or components in the claims (e.g., "the surfaces (1-A) and (1-B)" at claim 31, line 4 is indefinite as to which particular element or component's "surfaces" are intended); and the use of exemplary claim language (e.g., "such as LED's" at claim 38, line 3; "arranged like the slats of a jalousie" at claim 42, line 4) is indefinite since the scope of the recitation--i.e., the range of elements or arrangements that are encompassed by the claim--cannot be determined.

Art Unit: 2612

12. Claims 27-51 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and/or the objection(s) under 37 CFR 1.75(a), set forth in this Office action.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The art cited by applicant has been considered. Rodriguez et al (US 2003/169160) is a U.S. equivalent of ES 2168071, cited by applicant. Carter et al (US 2004/114384), Robison (US 2003/7362) and Kayama (US 6250784) are cited to further show the state of the art.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mullen whose telephone number is 571-272-2965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached on (571) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Thomas J. Mullen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612